CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.551
12 April 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 12 April 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Ahmad Kamal (Pakistan)

GE.90-60694/1798B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 551st plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference continues today its consideration of agenda item 8, "Comprehensive programme of disarmament". However, in conformity with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

I have on my list of speakers today the representatives of China, the Republic of Korea, Japan and the German Democratic Republic.

I now give the floor to the representative of China, Ambassador Hou Zhitong.

Mr. HOU (China) (translated from Chinese): It gives me great pleasure to make my first statement at a plenary meeting in the month of April. At the outset, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to extend warm greetings and congratulations to Your Excellency Ambassador Kamal, the eminent representative of my country's friendly neighbour, non-aligned Pakistan, on your taking up the important post of President of the Conference for the last month of the spring session. I am confident that with your erudition, rich experience and outstanding diplomatic skills you will surely guide our work towards fruitful results and contribute to new progress in our deliberations and negotiations. You can count on my delegation's full and constructive co-operation with you and with the other delegations.

I would also like to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Azikiwe of Nigeria, and thank him for his skilful guidance of our work in March and for his remarkable efforts and accomplishments.

People throughout the world have long aspired to and pressed for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons. Naturally, this has been a priority subject for in-depth negotiations in the Conference, on which world-wide attention is riveted. Since the spring session began, we have listened attentively to various ideas, views and proposals put forward by other delegations on this matter. Today the Chinese delegation would like to share some of its thoughts with other delegations, with a view to jointly exploring ways to deepen and advance the negotiating process. To begin with, I wish to point out that my Government has always attached great importance to and placed high hopes on the ongoing negotiations on the CW convention in our Conference. Premier Li Peng of the State Council of the People's Republic of China stated on 20 March in his report on the work of the Government to the National People's Congress that the Chinese Government hoped to see progress in the Conference on Disarmament in concluding an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Not long ago, during his first visit to the Conference, the Chinese Foreign Minister, Qian Qichenn, in a statement at the plenary meeting, outlined the basic position and propsitions of the Chinese Government on a series of important disarmament issues, including the prohibition of chemical weapons. This once again reflected my Government's positive attitude to promoting disarmament and contributing to international peace and security. My delegation will, as instructed by the Chinese

(Mr. Hou, China)

Government, work energetically towards the early conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons.

The Chinese Government pursues an independent foreign policy of peace aimed at safeguarding international peace and security. China therefore has always firmly stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons, so as to free mankind once and for all from the danger and threat posed by such weapons of mass destruction. It is well known that China is a non-chemical-weapon State that neither possesses nor produces chemical weapons. The Chinese people fell victim to such weapons in the past, and even today such weapons abandoned by foreign aggressors during the war are discovered from time to time on our territory. In their utmost abhorrence of chemical weapons and chemical warfare, the Chinese people are determined to contribute to the early realization of a world free of chemical weapons. We wish to reiterate that the objective of the CW convention is to ensure the unconditional, complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons and their production facilities, and a total and lasting ban on the production and use of chemical weapons. We also propose that pending the conclusion and entry into force of the convention, all chemical-weapon States should unconditionally undertake not to use or produce chemical weapons, while all other States refrain from the development, production and acquisition of chemical weapons.

It is gratifying to note that with the development in the international situation, some headway has been made in the field of disarmament. A series of important initiatives by the international community has generated good momentum for banning chemical weapons. The Paris Conference of January 1989 adopted a Final Declaration which reaffirmed the validity of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and urged the banning of the use of chemical weapons and acceleration of the ongoing negotiations on the CW convention. This was followed by the Canberra Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons in September, which also provided a powerful political impetus for reaching the objective of prohibiting chemical weapons. Representatives from our Government and chemical industry took an active part in both conferences. We appreciate the French and Australian initiatives in this connection and the efforts of all participating States. The ninth non-aligned summit and the fourty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly also adopted important resolutions and put forth numerous positive proposals on this subject.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that over recent years, with the energetic efforts of the CD members and non-members and under the skilful guidance of successive chairmen of the CW Ad hoc Committee, negotiations on the CW convention have registered positive results. The basic structure of the future convention has already taken shape, and a large measure of consensus has been achieved on quite a few provisions. The ongoing negotiations are gathering momentum and developing in depth. It should be mentioned that last year, under the dynamic leadership of Ambassador Morel, the Ad hoc Committee did a great deal of useful work and achieved certain results. This year the Ad hoc Committee speedily set about its work upon its smooth re-establishment with a new and improved mandate, which dropped

(Mr. Hou, China)

the phrase "except for its final drafting" that had been there since 1984 and incorporated the positive wording "at the earliest date" contained in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. We appreciate this encouraging development. Currently, the re-established Ad hoc Committee, under the remarkable leadership of the experienced Swedish diplomat, Ambassador Hyltenius, is embarking on a positive exercise of in-depth negotiations. It is our hope and conviction that this year the Committee will register fresh progress as it approaches the critical stage of the negotiations.

Looking at the realities of the world today, one cannot but be keenly aware of the continued presence of disturbing factors of turbulence and instability. Threats to international peace and security remain. Mankind still lives under the threat of various types of barbarous weapons, including chemical weaponry. Although the Geneva Protocol banning the use of chemical weapons has existed for 65 years, from time to time its authority has been challenged and its effectiveness undermined. A small number of military Powers already possessing formidable chemical arsenals are pressing ahead with the production and modernization of such weapons. This undoubtedly poses a major obstacle to the negotiations on the convention. The harsh reality facing us is that the answer to the question whether and when a breakthrough in our negotiations is possible depends by and large on whether the countries possessing the largest chemical arsenals have sufficient political will to fulfil their special responsibilities in real earnest. Without looking back too far into history, the international community has been urging the super-Powers at least since the mid-1970s to make substantive progress in their bilateral CW negotiations at an early date and to contribute with actual deeds to the multilateral negotiating process. The international community expects them to renounce the use of chemical weapons, destroy their existing stocks and production facilities completely and halt the production and development of chemical weapons. We believe that such an unconditional commitment on their part will surely have the most positive bearing on the multilateral negotiations, thereby contributing to progress towards the objective of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons on a global scale. That is the logical course for the ongoing negotiation to take.

Recent years have witnessed an increase in the number of optimistic statements on the bilateral CW negotiations. Needless to say, substantive bilateral breakthroughs conducive to multilateral negotiations, once they do occur, should be duly welcomed. Years of negotiation between the United States and the USSR have so far yielded a certain measure of progress, with both sides announcing their readiness to reduce their huge CW arsenals. This is long overdue. No further progress is discernible, however, other than this vague expression of their intention to slash a portion of their CW arsenals within a relatively long time frame in the future. They have neither jointly pledged to halt CW production and improvement nor shown a common desire to refrain from the use of chemical weapons. This falls far short of the expectations of the Conference and the international community as a whole.

(Mr. Hou, China)

Alarmingly, not only is there an absence of commitment to the complete elimination and total destruction of existing chemical weapons, but also a new argument has been advanced for the retention of chemical weapons. It is held that even after joining the convention, a State party still has the right to retain a portion of its stockpiles should any country which it unilaterally and subjectively judges to be "CW-capable" not become a party to the convention. Furthermore, there are signs on their part indicating an attempt to keep their CW production facilities ready for resumption of production at any moment. The authors of this argument claim that this will enhance the universality of the convention. In fact, if anything this has set up new obstacles for the negotiations, and therefore has already caused widespread concern and opposition. The reason is simple and clear. Article I of the "rolling text" of the draft convention stipulates justly and unequivocally that the obligation regarding the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons and their production facilities should unconditionally apply to all States parties. If any State party is free to attach conditions to this fundamental obligation to meet its own needs, the very foundation of our negotiations will crumble and the nature of the convention will be changed. The convention will then at best be an instrument for quantitative restrictions or for CW non-proliferation. If the above-mentioned argument prevails, it will provide any State possessing chemical weapons and CW production facilities with a handy pretext for retaining a certain quantity of its stockpiles and production facilities, thus subjecting the numerous non-chemical-weapon States to a perpetual threat from chemical weapons. Obviously, this will either preclude the possibility of concluding the convention or lead to a convention of a discriminatory and unequal nature.

Here another closely related and important matter should be addressed, that is, the question of banning the use of chemical weapons. It is common knowledge that the prohibition of use constitutes one of the fundamental obligations under the future convention. Without this there will be no complete prohibition to speak of. It is precisely for this reason that since 1985 article I of the draft convention has contained the explicit obligation that "each State party undertakes not to use chemical weapons", to which no objection has been raised from any side. We have noted the reference to non-use in the recent United States-USSR joint statement, and we welcome this. However, in the multilateral consultations on the mandate of the CW Ad hoc Committee, there was downright rejection of the same reference, which cannot but make people feel puzzled. Its implications are even more disquieting when viewed together with the proposal that a portion of chemical weapons and their production facilities should be retained. Against this background, the Group of 21 non-aligned and neutral countries solemnly stated on 15 March that "the future convention on chemical weapons should prohibit the use of such weapons under any circumstance from the date the convention enters into force", that "all chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities shall be destroyed during the destruction period of 10 years", and that "this undertaking shall be without any reservation". The Chinese delegation would like to stress that it fully supports these reasonable

(Mr. Hou, China)

propositions of the Group of 21, which are in complete accord with our own. We hope to see the speedy removal of this new artificial obstacle, so that our negotiation returns to its normal track.

The verification of the CW convention, including challenge inspection, is an important issue of universal concern in our negotiations. It not only has a direct bearing on the sovereignty and important rights and interests of all States, but also concerns the authority, effectiveness and viability of the convention itself. For this reason, it should be the subject of serious and in-depth consultations and negotiations so as to find a just and reasonable solution acceptable to all. The Chinese Foreign Minister, Qian Qichen, set out the principled position of the Chinese Government in his statement on 27 February.

> "... we are in favour of an effective, reasonable and feasible verification régime under the convention, including challenge inspection. In the mean time we maintain that challenge inspection should not go beyond the purposes, objectives and scope of the convention, and that its possible abuse must be strictly guarded against. Specific provisions should ensure a balance between the rights and obligations of the requesting State on the one hand and those of the requested State on the other, and give full play to the role of the future organization."

Firstly, this shows that China is in favour of an appropriate challenge inspection régime which is fair, reasonable and practicable. This régime should act as a deterrent to possible violations of the convention and contribute to timely detection and correction of such acts once they do occur. Such a challenge inspection régime will strengthen the effectiveness of the convention and confidence in it.

Secondly, I would like to point out that the principal objective of the convention is to enhance international peace and the security of all States through the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons. The sole purpose of verification, including challenge inspection, is to serve the realization of the principles and objectives of the convention. To this end, it should strictly function within the scope of the convention to ensure effective compliance. However, any abuse of the highly intrusive challenge inspection procedure, any attempt to use challenge inspection to unduly interfere in the political, economic, military, technical or other fields of the security of States parties that have nothing to do with the purposes and objectives of the CW convention, would not only infringe upon the rights and interests of the States parties, but would also endanger the very existence of the convention. Hence it is necessary to stress the principles governing verification unanimously adopted by UNDC and endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1988. In these principles it is expressly stipulated that requests for inspections "should be used only for the purposes of the determination of compliance, care being taken to avoid abuses", and that verification arrangements should "avoid unduly interfering with the internal affairs of States parties or other States, or jeopardizing their economic,

(Mr. Hou, China)

technological and social development". These important principles are without doubt applicable to all forms of verification of international disarmament agreements, the highly intrusive challenge inspection being no exception.

Thirdly, given the complex realities in current international relations and the intrusive and sensitive nature of challenge inspection, the possibility of abuse of challenge inspection, like that of the violation of the convention, cannot be precluded. Both the violation and the abuse will compromise the authority and effectiveness of the convention, and should equally be guarded against. Appropriate and specific measures must therefore be instituted for such possibilities, so that in the event that violations or abuses of the provisions of the convention do occur, there will be timely detection, correction and, if necessary, adoption of sanctions.

Fourthly, it should be emphasized that challenge inspection in a global multilateral convention is an unprecedented novelty in the practice of international law, and should be treated with particular caution. With no precedent to guide us, we should follow strictly the 3 verification principles contained in the final document of SSOD-I and the 16 principles adopted by UNDC as the basis and yardstick of our work, and avoid going against them, for these principles have been formulated as a result of careful consideration by the representatives of all countries, taking into account the interests and concerns of all sides. It should also be pointed out that even in the arms control agreements between the two military alliances or the two super-Powers, including agreements and statements on chemical weapons, there has never been anything of such an absolute and all-embracing nature. Besides, multilateral agreements should not mechanically copy the provisions of bilateral ones, because there are significant differences between them. Any provision in bilateral agreements is based on equality and reciprocity between the two parties, which can be described as two sides of the same coin. The situation in the multilateral field is far more complex and varied, as States parties to the future convention include various countries of the East, West, North and South with great differences in their political, economic, military and security circumstances, as well as the level and stage of their scientific and technological development. Issues such as how to prevent discrimination and ensure the equality and equal rights and obligations of all countries, and how to establish a balance between rights and obligations for countries of different categories, are by nature extremely difficult, yet must be properly resolved. Otherwise, the universality of the convention will be only an empty word. Precisely because of this it is clearly stipulated in the aforementioned principles adopted by UNDC that "verification arrangements should be implemented without discrimination" and that "all States have equal rights to participate in the process of international verification of agreements to which they are parties". Therefore, in addition to undertaking the obligation of being subject to verification, many non-aligned countries have expressed their wish to obtain rights for equal participation in verification, as well as the capabilities and means to exercise such rights. This is reasonable.

(Mr. Hou, China)

Fifthly, in our view, only at the initial stage of making the request is there somehow a bilateral dimension to challenge inspection. Once the request has been made and challenge inspection initiated, it becomes a serious matter of multilateral international relations. Therefore, it should be handled by the organization of the convention by normal international legal means rather than through bilateral ways and means. With regard to challenge inspection under the convention on chemical weapons, it is imperative to rely on the organization and its appropriate organs which should play the major role throughout the entire inspection process. Only in this way will it be possible to deal correctly with violations of the convention and redress them, prevent abuses as far as possible and handle the relationship between the various States parties in a fair, reasonable and balanced manner, including the respective rights and obligations of the requesting countries and the inspected countries.

Especially at present, when international relations are moving towards democratization, in settling disputes in multilateral relations no country should be allowed to be an omnipotent arbitrator playing at the same time the role of plaintif, prosecutor, judge and investigator, while putting other countries in the position of defendants to be presumed guilty and sentenced without any right of appeal. Such a practice is both intolerable in the domestic law of any country and contrary to recognized international legal norms, and is therefore unacceptable. Naturally, to incorporate the above-mentioned principles and the sound suggestions made by many delegations into the relevant provisions and implementation procedures of the convention will require further in-depth study and consultation, as well as careful drafting.

The destruction of chemical weapons abandoned by foreign countries in the countries which have fallen victim to a CW attack constitutes an issue of principle which must be correctly resolved in the future convention. The abandoning of chemical weapons by a country on the territory of another not only concerns the past and the present but raises the possibility of a recurrence in the future. Thus it naturally concerns any potential CW-abandoning countries and attacked countries, that is to say the rights and obligations of all States parties are at stake. Therefore it is an issue directly related to the maintainance of peace and security. In this light, as a permanent international legal instrument of unlimited duration, the CW convention should contain equitable provisions of principle. It is only natural that the convention, as a minimum, should explicitly stipulate the responsibility of user countries and CW-abandoning countries for the destruction of chemical weapons in question. This is also a well-established principle in handling international armed conflicts and war liabilities, and should be reflected clearly as a rule of principle in the convention. Of course, the principle does not exclude appropriate specific arrangements by the countries concerned through consultations and negotiations. To require the attacked countries to bear responsibility for the destruction of the chemical weapons abandoned by other countries would be unfair and can only encourage the use of chemical weapons and aggression; it is therefore unacceptable.

(Mr. Hou, China)

I also wish to reiterate China's principled position and views on two important issues related to the convention - article X, on assistance, and article XI, on economic and technological development, in the "rolling text". The convention should explicitly stipulate that necessary international assistance should be provided to States parties attacked with chemical weapons. This is not only indispensable for their security, but will also serve as a deterrent and sanction against the use of CW. The convention should also encourage and promote the development of the civilian chemical industry, as well as strengthen international co-operation and exchanges in this regard. The Chinese delegation understands and supports the legitimate rights and interests and reasonable demands of the numerous third world developing countries in this regard. These two articles are also directly related to the important principle of the undiminished security of all States parties and the major issue of universal adherence, and should be appropriately addressed in the negotiations.

The realization of the objective of the complete prohibition of chemical weapons is an arduous task. We have traversed a long distance and made some progress, yet some complex and difficult issues have still to be resolved. We are fully convinced that we must and can reach our objective. The Chinese delegation will as always work in joint efforts with other delegations and contribute to the early achievement of this noble goal.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of China for his important statement and for the courteous words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea, Ambassador Sang Ock Lee.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, allow me to extend to you our warm congratulations on your taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of April. I wish you every success in discharging your important responsibility. As Pakistan and the Republic of Korea have enjoyed a friendly and co-operative relationship, and as you yourself were the diplomat on the spot as Ambassador of Pakistan to my country and made an active contribution to furthering the ties between our two countries, it gives me particular pleasure to see you presiding over the Conference. My country has been invited again this year to participate as a non-member State in the plenary meetings and in two subsidiary bodies of the Conference, namely, the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and the Ad hoc Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation appreciates the decision and looks forward to making constructive contributions.

The reforms and changes taking place in Central Europe account for a transition away from the cold war system and open up a new dimension of international relations conducive to openness and co-operation among States transcending ideological and political differences. Amidst the unfolding of such developments, my delegation is inclined to render a positive view on the future of international relations. This evolution augurs well for the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Highlighting the warm climate of the times was

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

the summit meeting held in Malta last December between the two super-Powers, which set the stage for a series of positive moves towards settlement of major outstanding disarmament issues.

The breakthrough on a key issue at the Foreign Ministers' talks held in Moscow in February between the United States and the Soviet Union underscores a major step forward in the ongoing START talks expected to be concluded in the near future. Also viewed as a sign of headway in the negotiation is the reaching of agreement to sign a bilateral accord on chemical weapons at the forthcoming summit meeting.

The holding of the "open skies" conference in Ottawa demonstrated unremitting efforts to explore and validate a new dimension of confidence-building in the East-West disarmament talks. The Conference was also a venue for obtaining agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on troop strength reductions in Central Europe. With this accord reached, the conclusion of the negotiations on conventional forces in Europe is perceived as a likely reality before the year's end. My Government welcomes these developments and hopes that they will have a positive influence on the negotiations undertaken by the Conference on Disarmament.

Much effort has been devoted to negotiating a convention banning chemical weapons, as the issue has been the focus of world-wide attention and concern. Inter-sessional work by the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons was a reinforcing and complementary link to this year's negotiations. My delegation hopes that the spirit of accommodation and compromise will continue to be the guiding force in narrowing the remaining differences.

The international Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons held in Canberra last year provided an excellent occasion to affirm the weighty responsibilities of industry in negotiations on chemical weapons, and demonstrated that progress is possible when political ideals and practical goals are linked. As my delegation stressed at the Canberra Conference, the development of chemicals for peaceful purposes and the protection of confidentiality are two important dimensions to which due consideration should continue to be given.

National trial inspections have contributed to the efforts to establish a common formula for verification. Much hope is placed on the realization of multilateral trial inspections in order to remove the remaining obstacles.

The Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will be convened in Geneva in August of this year. As the forthcoming review conference is the final one of its kind under the mandate of the NPT, it will have significant implications for the future of the NPT up to and beyond the year 1995. Despite the long-standing contention on the genesis of the NPT, the contributions which the Treaty has made to international peace and security deserve wide recognition and appreciation.

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

The NPT calls for horizontal as well as vertical non-proliferation, as they are a corollary to universal adherence whereby the Treaty's success will be assured. As a party to the Treaty since 1975, my country is fully committed to its obligations under the Treaty, including international safeguards. As the safeguard measures are a sine qua non for non-proliferation, those whose commitments fall short of such steps are called upon to complete their commitments by placing their nuclear facilities under full-scope international safeguards.

Security assurances provided by nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States from another facet of the problem whereby the question of non-proliferation has been addressed. Security situations vary from region to region and from country to country. They resist a common formula and make elaboration difficult. Nevertheless, unilateral declarations by individual nuclear-weapon States on negative security assurances, along with the positive security assurances set forth in Security Council resolution 255 of 1968, serve as a useful and practical basis pending further refinement of this approach.

The position regarding the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones is similar. The establishment of such a zone in one region does not necessarily warrant the same in another. The approach is viable only when there is agreement among all States concerned in a region, and when regional characteristics are fully taken.

The world-wide trend towards openness and reconciliation increasingly leads the way in favour of international dialogue and understanding. Regrettably, however, such is not yet the case with the situation on the Korean peninsula. With hostility and tension remaining unabated, it has not removed the vestiges of the cold war era. The improved East-West relations and the progress in their disarmament talks as we witness today are undoubtedly a result of confidence-building efforts pursued over a considerable span of time. However, current inter-Korean relations lack the necessary trust and confidence upon which any such reconciliation process has to be based.

A number of proposals on inter-Korean exchanges have been made by my country with the aim of increasing mutual trust and confidence between the two parts of Korea. Inter-Korean talks to this end have been conducted at various levels. Talks between the Red Cross societies on reuniting families displaced during the Korean war, talks between parliamentarians and talks on inter-Korean trade were the major undertakings in this endeavour. My Government sincerely hopes that the inter-Korean talks now under suspension will resume as soon as possible.

The idea of establishing a "peace city" in the demilitarized zone is also a significant initiative put forward by us as a confidence-building measure pending realization of active exchanges between the two parts of Korea. Also at the beginning of this year, we proposed the early conclusion of agreements

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

on inter-Korean travel and communications with a view to promoting mutual opening-up and exchanges. However, such initiatives have not been answered by the other side with comparable measures, apparently due to its inability to break away from isolation and follow the changes prevailing in today's world. As we strongly believe that the building of trust and confidence between the two parts of Korea is part and parcel of advancing any of their meaningful dialogues, including disarmament, we will continue to pursue these efforts. Despite the contention invariably put forward by the other side, it is an undeniable fact that security arrangements made by my country have proven to be a most realistic and effective means of preserving stability and peace on the Korean peninsula. The genesis of the Korean War makes such arrangements imperative, and as long as hostility and tension remains undiminished, there is a need to maintain the basic defence structure.

A joint military exercise with our ally called "Team Spirit" has been held annually. It is designed to enhance defence prepardeness against the recurrence of hostilities on the Korean peninsula. This year the scale of the exercise was reduced. Invitations were extended to North Korea and China along with four member countries of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission overseeing the military armistice, namely Czechoslovakia, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland, to send observers to the exercise, with a view to increasing the openness and transparency of the exercise's defensive nature. We are hoping that the steps we have taken will be reciprocated when similar military exercises take place in the northern part of the Korean peninsula.

My country is steadily improving relations with countries whose ideological and political differences were hindering factors in the past. Improved relations with these nations is an important confidence-building effort, and they also increase global influence for the removal of barriers standing in the way of the inter-Korean reconciliation process. When mutual confidence and trust lead to the removal of the barriers, the Korean people, both South and North, will be able to find the way to a durable and lasting peace on the Korean peninsula and attainment of the peaceful reunification of the divided country.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his statement, and would like to address a very sincere kamsa hamnida to him for the very courteous and kind words addressed to this Chair and to my person.

The last two speakers will deal with the progress report of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. Before we proceed to consider it, may I ask whether any other delegation wishes to take the floor on any other matter at this stage? Since that does not seem to be the case, I will now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Mr. Watanabe, as co-ordinator of the Western Group for agenda item 1, "Nuclear test ban".

Mr. WATANABE (Japan): It gives us great pleasure to see Pakistan presiding over the Conference on Disarmament for the month of April. Pakistan and Japan have enjoyed excellent relations over the years. We assure you of our full co-operation in the fulfilment of your duties.

(Mr. Watanabe, Japan)

Today, on behalf of a group of Western countries, I would like to speak on the progress report on the twenty-ninth session of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, contained in document CD/981, which was introduced by Dr. Ola Dahlman of Sweden on 5 April.

The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking highly appreciate the continued excellent work carried out by the Group, under its mandate set out in CD/46, in "elaborating instructions and specifications for international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events ... which might be established in the future for the international exchange of seismological data under a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon tests covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes in a protocol which would be an integral part of the treaty".

We note with great satisfaction that the second phase of the Group's Second Large-scale Technical Test (GSETT-2) started successfully on 16 January 1990. Dr. Dahlman stated that "to operate a system in the real world differs considerably from conceptually designing it", but we are confident that the success of the phase 3 full-scale experiment now planned for the first half of next year has been made more likely by improved preparation to be conducted under the revised schedule of remaining GSETT-2 activities.

We share with the group its satisfaction that efforts are under way in some 10 additional countries to join the experiment and to establish national data centres. We welcome the Group's decision that countries able to contribute only level I data may now also participate in GSETT-2. And we sincerely hope that together with the rescheduling of future activities, this will encourage those countries which have not yet done so, especially in South America, Africa and Asia, to join in the work of the Group.

Before concluding, we would like to express our sincere appreciation to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), which has made its Global Telecommunication System available to the GSE. Its continued co-operation will be essential for the success of GSETT-2.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Japan for his statement made on behalf of the Western Group, and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Dietze, who will speak in his capacity as Co-ordinator of the Socialist Group for agenda item 1.

Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic): May I use this occasion, Sir, to express to you the extreme pleasure of my delegation at seeing you presiding over the Conference on Disarmament during this month. I am doing so in the conviction that under your efficient stewardship, the spring session of the Conference will produce positive and encouraging results which could lead us to a good start and substantial progess during the forthcoming summer session. Let me also express my appreciation for the efforts undertaken by you to facilitate the work of the CD in different fields. I assure you of my

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

delegation's fullest support. The outgoing President, Ambassador Azikiwe, deserves our appreciation and gratitute for his committed and competent efforts during the past period of work.

The group on whose behalf I have the the honour to take the floor attaches great importance to the work of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts. By devising and testing a global seismic data exchange system, the GSE renders a significant contribution to setting up the scientific and technological basis for verification of compliance with a future comprehensive test-ban treaty. In so doing, the Ad hoc Group is effectively contributing to the work on a nuclear item which falls to the responsibility of the Conference on Disarmament.

We are satisfied with the progress achieved so far in the experiment on the exchange of level II data. Wide experience has been gained in this process, which is valuable for its continuation and successful conclusion. At this juncture, I should like to express our gratitude and appreciation to all scientists from the countries participating in GSETT-2 for the purposeful work accomplished by them and, in particular, to Dr. Dahlman (Sweden) and Dr. Basham (Canada) for their dedicated activities in this endeavour.

As it was stated by Dr. Ola Dahlman on 5 April 1990 here in this forum, the Group of Scientific Experts, during its spring session, carried out comprehensive work with a view to solving manifold organizational and scientific and technological questions connected with this experiment. We welcome the activities planned to settle several problems that remain pending, especially in connection with the processing of the amount of transmitted data, which was much larger than anticipated. The co-operation with WMO will be conducive to finding answers to the unresolved questions concerning data transmission. We agree with the revision of the preliminary schedule for GSETT-2, as well as with paragraphs 9 and 13 of the progress report on the twenty-ninth session of the GSE.

Our Group considers the broadest possible participation by States in GSETT-2 to be of major importance. This would help improve the conditions for testing the concept for a global data exchange system specified in the GSE's fifth report in a realistic environment. So far 21 countries, some of them having strongly differing starting positions in terms of science and technology, personnel and finance, have successfully participated in the experiment. We welcome the fact that more States, among them countries from our Group, have expressed their intention of taking part in future GSETT-2 activities and are making preparations in this regard. The decisions of the Ad hoc Group to reduce the technical requirements for participation in the experiment are appropriate for encouraging even wider participation in this important experiment.

The advanced stage in the work of the GSE offers opportunities for the Conference on Disarmament to consider broadening the scope of its deliberations of verification methods for a future CTBT. This includes, inter alia, the elaboration of procedures for on-site inspections, satellite remote sensing and atmospheric radioactivity surveillance. The countries on

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

whose behalf I am speaking consider that substantive work should be started by experts in the Ad hoc Group with an extended mandate or in another appropriate organizational framework which goes beyond questions of seismology.

In conclusion, permit me to make another remark regarding the establishment of an ad hoc committee on agenda item 1. We welcome the fact that all groups have agreed, without prejudice to their preferred draft mandate, to work towards consensus on the basis of the draft mandate contained in document CD/863. This signals increased readiness to resume substantive work on agenda item 1, "Nuclear test ban". We hope that it will be possible to set up a committee on this agenda item at the very beginning of the summer session. As was emphasized in the plenary debate, this would provide the necessary political framework for consideration of the important results of GSETT-2.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for his statement and his very kind words. I now give the floor to the representative of China, Ambassador Hou Zhitong.

Mr. HOU (China) (translated from Chinese): The Chinese delegation listened carefully to the progress report on the twenty-ninth session of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. We would like to welcome the successful conclusion of the twenty-ninth session of the Group. The Chinese delegation expresses its appreciation of the constructive work of the Group of Scientific Experts. We are also appreciative of the positive efforts made by the Chairman of the Group, Dr. Dahlman of Sweden, and its Co-ordinator, Dr. Basham of Canada. En passant I would like to say that the appropriate departments and experts in our country are seriously considering participation in international data exchange experiments on seismic events. We have noted that the meeting of the Group has decided to postpone phase three of the large-scale experiment. This will lead to better results in the experiment on a larger scale.

The PRESIDENT: You will recall that at our last plenary meeting, I announced that we would take action today on the recommendations contained in paragraphs 9 and 13 of the progress report of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events.

In connection with paragraph 9, the Chair circulated, at the plenary meeting held on 5 April, the draft of a letter that I as President will address to the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Oganization in connection with the participation of a member of the Ad hoc Group in the next session of the WMO Commission for Basic Systems Working Group on the Global Telecommunication System. It was noted at that plenary meeting that, if no objections were raised before today's plenary meeting, the letter would be sent as drafted. No objections have been received and, accordingly, I shall proceed as indicated.

(The President)

In connection with the recommendation contained in paragraph 13 of the Ad hoc Group's progress report, we are invited to adopt it in order to determine the dates for the next session of that subsidiary body. The Ad hoc Group has proposed that its next session should be held between 30 July and 10 August 1990. If there is no objection raised I shall take it that the Conference adopts that recommendation.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I have conducted consultations with the co-ordinators of the various Groups and with China on the question of the opening date for the second part of the 1990 session of the Conference. As a result of these consultations, we have agreed on Tuesday, 12 June. Therefore, I suggest that we now take the relevent decision. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Conference agrees on Tuesday, 12 June as the opening date for the second part of the annual session.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The secretariat has circulated today at my request a timetable for meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the coming week. The timetable has been prepared in consultation with the chairmen of subsidiary bodies and, as usual, is merely indicative and subject to change, if necessary. As announced earlier, there will be no meetings on Monday, 16 April, as this is an official holiday for the United Nations Office at Geneva. Provision is made in the timetable for the first informal meeting on agenda item 3, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", on Tuesday, 17 April immeditely after the plenary meeting. I might also mention, for the information of all delegates, that - very tentatively, and subject to a response ad referendum from one of the co-ordinators - we are considering the afternoon of Friday, 20 April, for the totally informal open-ended consultations on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. The notification, subject to the response received from one co-ordinator, will be given at the beginning of next week.

If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Conference adopts the timetable as circulated.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I have no other business for today, and I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 17 April, at 10 a.m. I wish you all a Happy Easter.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.